

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 15 is amendment and claims 21-26 are added. No new matter is added.

The Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners Wood and Jankus in the September 14, 2005 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A. Claims 1-7 and 9-20

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7 and 9-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,343,317 to Glorikian. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-7 and 9-20 would not have been rendered obvious by Glorikian. Glorikian does not disclose "correlating service to a virtual object which is data having spatial information, relating to shape and location, that is constructed on computer...," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 11, 12, 15-20.

That is, in the instant application, service is provided for a specified space using a virtual object. The virtual object is data having spatial information, relating to shape and location, constructed on computer corresponding to a specified space. By correlating the information to service via a virtual object, control can be simply accomplished in which service is provided at some locations and not provided at other locations.

Glorikian, instead, only discloses that each exhibit is documented in a information database by location from an arbitrary reference point. See, e.g., Glorikian, col. 7, lines 43-58. That is, service stored in the information database in Glorikian is merely correlated with a specified location and not to a virtual object. Further, the database of Glorikian is only a simple Cartesian reference system that lists locations of the exhibits in two dimensions from a reference point. See, e.g., Glorikian, col. 7, lines 43-57. See e.g., Glorikian, col. 7, lines 43-

58. Thus, because the service of Glorkian is correlated to the positional information of a portable terminal, which has been inputted, the system of Glorkian is more difficult than managing the claimed system.

Further, Glorikian does not disclose "an input device that performs an input related to at least one of generation, deletion, and update of the object information; and an object-information processing device that generates, deletes, or updates the object information according to the content of the input performed by the input device," as recited in claim 12, and as similarly recited in 17. Glorikian also does not disclose "performing an input related to at least one of generation, deletion, and update of the object information; and at least one of generating, deleting, and updating the object information based on the content of the performed input," as recited in claim 20. Similarly, Glorikian does not disclose "an input device that generates the data for the virtual object, the input device transmitting the data to the storage device," as recited in claim 21, and as similarly recited in claims 22-26. Nowhere does Glorkian disclose this feature.

Thus, independent claims 1, 11, 12 and 15-20 are patentable over Glorikian. Further, claims 2-7, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 21-26, which variously depend from the independent claims, are also patentable over Glorikian for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

B. Claim 8

The Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Glorikian in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,326,918 to Stewart. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 would not have been rendered obvious by Glorikian in view of Stewart. Stewart does not remedy the deficiencies of Glorikian discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claim 8 depends from claim 1. Thus, claim 8 is patentable over Glorikian and Stewart for

at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1, as well as additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/brp

Attachment:
Amendment Transmittal

Date: September 28, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

| |
|--|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p> |
|--|